OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results ہ	oresentation			
Actual	D	E	С	D	С
SCENARIO:	SPR & 142 St Pre-Developme	ent AM			
Area Type:	Neighbourhood Connector				
MODE	*	್	1=		
уре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	D	D	В	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	LRT Access				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	Е	С	D	С
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	gs provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
ls a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inte	rsection?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for (etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0.76 - 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	13 - 14	60 - 84%
Mooning 3	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	13.0 - 14.9	13.0 - 14.9	21 - 35	E	56 - 80
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
ivieasure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
			1		

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	know and for detailed or summary results p	presentation			
Actual	D	Е	С	D	С
SCENARIO:	SPR & 142 St Pre-Developme	nt PM			
Area Type:	Neighbourhood Connector				
MODE	*	्र	1届		—
ype			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	D	D	В	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	LRT Access				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	Ε	С	D	С
		Active Transportation	n Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provide	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for a etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0.76 - 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	13 - 14	60 - 84%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
iviedsul e Z	13.0 - 14.9	13.0 - 14.9	21 - 35	E	56 - 80
Maggiro 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	Greater than 120	Greater than 120	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	2.6 - 3.0	2.6 - 3.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	u know and for detailed or summary results រ ្ធាំ	presentation			
Actual	D D	F	С	В	В
SCENARIO: Area Type:	SPR & 149 St Pre-Developme Neighbourhood Main Street	ent AIVI			
MODE	Ķ	्रं	! ₽		
- Type			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Valley Line LRT		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	F	С	В	В
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for (etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	>1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Greater than 18	85 - 100%
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	Greater than or Equal to 18	Greater than or Equal to 18	21 - 35	D	36 - 55
Manuss 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)		-	-
ivicasure 4	Greater than 3	Greater than 3			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	_		_	_	
Actual	D	E	С	С	С
CENARIO: rea Type:	SPR & 149 St Pre-Developme Neighbourhood Main Street	ent PIVI			
MODE	广	ં	! ₩		
уре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Valley Line LRT		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	E	С	С	С
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inte	rsection?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for (etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	> 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Greater than 18	85 - 100%
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	Greater than or Equal to 18	Greater than or Equal to 18	21 - 35	F	Greater than 80
M 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	91 -105	91 - 105	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	Greater than 3	Greater than 3			

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what yo	u know and for detailed or summary results	presentation			
Actual	С	С	С	E	С
CENARIO:	SPR & 156 St Pre-Developme Urban Main Street	ent AM			
Area Type: MODE	*	Š O	↑ 🔂		
	Λ	0,0	T###	<u></u>	
ype			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Valley Line LRT R12 Rapidbus		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	С	С	С	E	С
		Active Transportatio	n Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		<u>ll</u>
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	> 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%
Mana 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	21 - 35	D	36 - 55
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service		-
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	С		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
Wicasule 4	2.1 - 2.5	1.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results	presentation	-		
Actual	С		С	E	С
SCENARIO:	SPR & 156 St Pre-Developme	nt PM			
Агеа Туре:	Urban Main Street	•	_		
MODE	*	~	1₽		
Туре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Valley Line LRT R12 Rapidbus		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	С	С	С	Е	С
		Active Transportation	n Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike fa	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
ls a continuou	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	rsection?	No
Does the intersection design provide	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	> 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%
M2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	11 - 20	D	36 - 55
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	С		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
Wicasule 4	2.1 - 2.5	1.0			

Actual									
	С	С	D	D	D				
CENARIO:	SPR & 158 St Pre-Developme Urban Main Street	nt AM							
Area Type:	*	्रं	!						
· vao			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS						
ype Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	D	D	D				
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None				
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	None	None	None	None				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None				
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)									
Actual	C		D	D	D				
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		T				
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	aching pedestrian facilities?		No				
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the inters	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes				
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings delineated for cyclists through the intersection?						
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes				
Does the intersection design provi	Have Accessibility for Ontaria		nd municipal accessibility	space, protected intersection,	Yes Yes				
Does the intersection design provi	Have Accessibility for Ontaria	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a	nd municipal accessibility ed?	space, protected intersection,					
	Have Accessibility for Ontaria	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere	nd municipal accessibility ed?	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m)					
Does the intersection design provi	Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS EV	nd municipal accessibility ed? aluation	Average Effective Turning Radius	Yes % of Movements with				
Measure 1	Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar	etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS EV Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	nd municipal accessibility ed? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes				
	Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	etc)? Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) a des (if applicable) been considered MMLOS EV Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius	aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11	Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes Less than 10%				
Measure 1 Measure 2	Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	etc)? Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) ands (if applicable) been considered MMLOS EV Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	nd municipal accessibility ed? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes Less than 10% Intersection Delay (s)				
Measure 1	Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9	etc)? In swith Disabilities Act (AODA) and (if applicable) been considered MMLOS EV Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9	nd municipal accessibility ed? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes Less than 10% Intersection Delay (s) 11 - 20				
Measure 1 Measure 2	Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	etc)? Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) and sids (if applicable) been considered MMLOS EV Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 11 - 20 Pedestrian Level of Service	Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes Less than 10% Intersection Delay (s) 11 - 20				

Actual	ı know and for detailed or summary results p	resentation			
	С	С	D	D	D
CENARIO:	SPR & 158 St Pre-Developme Urban Main Street	nt PM			
теа Туре:	•			<u> </u>	
MODE	 	્	1=		
ype			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	C	С	D	D	D
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		T
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		No
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the inters	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the	e intended turn movements for etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Ev	aluation		
Manaura 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities			
			Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any	(m)	Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1 Measure 2	0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	0 Average Effective Turning Radius	Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	(m) Less than 11	Dedicated Turn Lanes Less than 10%
Measure 2	0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s)	(m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Dedicated Turn Lanes Less than 10% Intersection Delay (s)
	0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9	0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9	Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 11 - 20	(m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service B	Dedicated Turn Lanes Less than 10% Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	O Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 11 - 20 Pedestrian Level of Service	(m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service B	Dedicated Turn Lanes Less than 10% Intersection Delay (s)

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what yo		oresentation	_		
Actual	CDD 9 162 St Dro Dovelopme	E	E	D	В
CENARIO: rea Type:	SPR & 163 St Pre-Developme Urban Main Street	ent Aivi			
MODE	 	ं	1		
			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
/pe Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	C	D	D
					_
Adjustment for Planning Direction Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Upwards Pedestrian Priority Area	Upwards 163 St District Connector	Upwards R12 Rapid Bus	None	None
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	None	None	None	None	None
Actual	E	Ε	Е	D	В
		Active Transportation			_
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	gs provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike	facility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	ous amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design prov	ide features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for (etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
ivieasure 1	0	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%
Marrian 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	21 - 35	С	
	9.0 - 10.9				21 - 35
Manager 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service		21 - 35
Measure 3		Signal Cycle Length (s) Greater than 120	Pedestrian Level of Service		
Measure 3 Measure 4	Signal Cycle Length (s)				

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	know and for detailed or summary results p	resentation			
Actual	D	D	D	D	В
	SPR & 163 St Pre-Developme	nt PM			
Area Type:	Urban Main Street				
MODE	 	್	1=		
			SICNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS C	D	D
				None	
Adjustment for Planning Direction Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Upwards Pedestrian Priority Area	Upwards 163 St District Connector	Upwards R12 Rapid Bus	None	None
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	None	None	None	TVOILE	None
Actual	D	D	D	D	В
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike fa	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuou	is amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline:	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provide	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for (etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	21 - 35	С	21 - 35
Maaaiii 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
Wicasare 4	2.6 - 3.0	2.6 - 3.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	u know and for detailed or summary results p	presentation			
Actual	С	С	С	Е	С
SCENARIO: Area Type:	95 Ave & 156 St Pre-Develop Urban Boulevard	ment AM			
MODE	 	ં	! ₽		
Гуре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	C	D	E
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	Hone	Valley Line LRT	110110	Trong
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	С	С	С	E	С
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		T
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	aching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	facility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inte	rsection?	Yes
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for (etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0.76 - 1	0.76 - 1	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	35 - 59%
Massure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	11 - 20	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
ivieasure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	С		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
INICUSUI C 4	2.1 - 2.5	1.1 - 1.5			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results p	resentation			
Actual	С	С	С	E	С
SCENARIO: Area Type:	95 Ave & 156 St Pre-Develop Urban Boulevard	ment PM			
MODE	 	્	<u> 1</u>		
Гуре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	C	D	Е
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	110110	Valley Line LRT	110110	Itolio
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	С	С	С	E	С
		Active Transportation	n Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline:	ated for cyclists through the inter	rsection?	Yes
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for (etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0.76 - 1	0.76 - 1	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	35 - 59%
Massure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	21 - 35	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
ivieasure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	С		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
incusure 4	2.1 - 2.5	1.1 - 1.5			

MODE Neighbourhood Connector	LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	know and for detailed or summary results p	presentation			
MODE MODE MODE SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS Target (Counter if recessary) Target (Counter if recessary) Target (Counter if recessary) Adjustment for Primaring Direction Measure 1 Measure 1 Measure 3 Measure 3 Measure 4 Measure 3 Measure 4 Measure 3 Measure 3 Measure 4 Measure 3 Measure 4 Measure 3 Measure 4 Measure 4 Measure 3 Measure 4 Measure 3 Measure 4 Measure 3 Measure 4 Measure 3 Measure 4 Measure 5 Measure 6 Measure 6 Measure 6 Measure 6 Measure 6 Measure 7 Measure 6 Measure 7 Measure 6 Measure 7 Measure 7 Measure 8 Measure 9 Mea		_	Е	С	С	В
Signal/Life	SCENARIO:		e-Development AM			
Target (Custom if necessary) Adjustment for Planning Direction Reasons for adjustment (if applicable) Reasons for adjustment (if appli	Area Type:	•				
Adjustment for Naming Direction Upwards None None None None None None None None	MODE	│	્	↑ ■ 1		
Adjustment for Naming Direction Upwards None None None None None None None None				<u> </u>		
Adjustment for Planning Direction Reasons for adjustment (if applicable) Reasons for adjustment	Гуре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Reasons for adjustment (If applicable) Adjustment for Startegic Policy Adjustment for Startegic Policy Adjustment for Startegic Policy Adjustment for Startegic Policy Actual D C C B Actual Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities? Yes Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)? No Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings delineated for cyclists through the intersection? No Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)? Yes WMLOS Evaluation Measure 1 Characed Pedestrian Measures Characed Replicable) Dean considered? Ves WINLOS Evaluation Average Effective Turning Radius (or) John 13 0 aminimum of one but for all all 13-14 (60-844) Jagottoches for families Measure 2 Signal Cycls Length (b) Signal Cycls Length (c) Signal Cycls Length (c) Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (pages add)	Target (Custom if necessary)	D	D	В	D	D
Reasons for Statistics Policy Reasons for Adjustment (If applicable) Actual D C C B Actual Actual Actual D C C B Actual Actual Actual Actual Actual D C C B Actual Actua	Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Actival D C C B Active Transportation Design Check Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities? Ves Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)? No Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings delineated for cyclists through the intersection? No Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g., bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)? Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered? **No** **MMLOS Evaluation** **MMLOS Evaluation** **MMLOS Evaluation** **Modesure 1** **Ord-1** On **Transit Priority Measure** **Average Effective Turning Radius on Similar Cone but not all approaching Radius (in) **Transit Priority Measure** **Average Effective Turning Radius (in) **Transit Movement Deby (s) **Car Level of Service Intersection Deby (s) ** **Average Effective Turning Radius (in) **Transit Movement Deby (s) **Car Level of Service Intersection Deby (s) ** **Measure 3** **Measure 4** **Measure 4** **Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach) ** **	Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area				
Active Transportation Design Check Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities? Pes Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)? No Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings delineated for cyclists through the intersection? No Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc.)? Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered? **MMLOS Evaluation** **MMLOS Evaluation** Measure 1 **Enhanced Pedestrian Measures** **Enhanced Risple Facilities** **Transit Priority Measures** **Average Effective Turning Radius** **Off-1** **Off-1** **Off-1** **Off-1** **Off-1** **Average Effective Turning Radius** **Intersection Delay (s) **Average Effective Turning Radius** **Intersection Delay (s) **Average Effective Turning Radius** **Intersection Delay (s) **Inters	Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Active Transportation Design Check Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities? Pyes Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)? No Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings delineated for cyclists through the intersection? No Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc.)? Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility Yes MINLOS Evaluation Measure 1 Cohance Pedestrian Measures Enhanced Bicycle Facilities Transit Priority Measures at a minimum of one but not all an imminum of one but not all and the processor of	Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Are marked pedestrian crossings provided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities? Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)? No Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings delineated for cyclists through the intersection? No Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc.)? Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility Yes **MMLOS Evaluation** **MMLOS Evaluation** **MMLOS Evaluation** **MMLOS Evaluation** **MMLOS Evaluation** **Measure 1** **Inhanced Pedestrian Measures** **Inhanced Pedestrian Mea	Actual	D	E		С	В
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)? No Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings delineated for cyclists through the intersection? No Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g., bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)? Yes Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered? **MMLOS Evaluation** **MMLOS Evaluation** **MMLOS Evaluation** **MMLOS Evaluation** **Moreover through the beautiful proving Radius of Contacted Turning Radius of Co			Active Transportation	on Design Check		
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings delineated for cyclists through the intersection? No Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)? Yes Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered? MMLOS Evaluation Measure 1 Enhanced Pedestrian Measures Enhanced Ricycle Facilities Transit Priority Measures Average Effective Turning Radius O, 76-1 0 Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit approaches for transit Average Effective Turning Radius (in) Average Effective Turning Radius Transit Movement Delay (s) Car Level of Service Intersection Delay (s) Measure 2 Signal Cycle Length (s) Signal Cycle Length (s) Signal Cycle Length (s) Pedestrian Level of Service Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/paproach) Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/paproach) Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/paproach)		Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings delineated for cyclists through the intersection? No Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)? Yes Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered? MMLOS Evaluation Measure 1 Enhanced Pedestrian Measures Enhanced Ricycle Facilities Transit Priority Measures Average Effective Turning Radius O, 76-1 0 Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit approaches for transit Average Effective Turning Radius (in) Average Effective Turning Radius Transit Movement Delay (s) Car Level of Service Intersection Delay (s) Measure 2 Signal Cycle Length (s) Signal Cycle Length (s) Signal Cycle Length (s) Pedestrian Level of Service Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/paproach) Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/paproach) Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/paproach)						
Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings delineated for cyclists through the intersection? No Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)? Yes Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered? MMLOS Evaluation Measure 1 Enhanced Pedestrian Measures Enhanced Bloyde Facilities Transit Priority Measures Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Transit Movement Delay (s) Enhanced Delay (s) Transit Movement Delay (s) Transit Prio	Door the approaching hike f	acility continue at a concistont w	idth up to the adap of the inters	action (crosswalk or such adap of	intercecting ready	Ne
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)? Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered? Wind Standards (if applicable) been considered?	boes the approaching bike in	acility continue at a consistent w	idili up to the edge of the interst	ection (crosswark or carb eage or	intersecting roadway):	NO
Does the intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intended turn movements for cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing space, protected intersection, etc)? Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered? Ves						
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered? MMLOS Evaluation	Is a continuou	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inte	rsection?	No
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered? MMLOS Evaluation						
Have Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility standards (if applicable) been considered? MMLOS Evaluation	Does the intersection design provide	de features which facilitate all th		cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Ves
Standards (if applicable) been considered? MMLOS Evaluation			etc)?			
Standards (if applicable) been considered? MMLOS Evaluation		Have Accessibility for Ontaria	ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a	nd municipal accessibility		
Measure 1 Enhanced Pedestrian Measures Enhanced Bicycle Facilities Transit Priority Measures Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Transit priority Measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) Car Level of Service Intersection Delay (s) Measure 3 Signal Cycle Length (s) Signal Cycle Length (s) Pedestrian Level of Service Transit Priority Measures Transit Priority Measures Transit Priority Measures Average Effective Turning Radius (m) For Level of Service Transit Movement Delay (s) Transit Priority Measures Transit Movement Delay (s) Car Level of Service Intersection Delay (s) Transit Movement						Yes
Measure 1 Enhanced Pedestrian Measures Enhanced Bicycle Facilities Transit Priority Measures Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Transit Movement Delay (s) Car Level of Service Intersection Delay (s) Measure 3 Signal Cycle Length (s) Signal Cycle Length (s) Pedestrian Level of Service Transit Movement Delay (s) D Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts /approach) Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts /approach) Conflicts (conflicts /approach)			MMI OS Ev	aluation		
Measure 1 O.76 - 1 O Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit Movement Delay (s) Measure 2 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Transit Movement Delay (s) Transit Movement Delay (s) Car Level of Service Intersection Delay (s) Measure 3 Signal Cycle Length (s) Signal Cycle Length (s) Pedestrian Level of Service O Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)					Average Effective Turning Radius	% of Movements with
Measure 2 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures		
Measure 2 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 13.0 - 14.9 13.0 - 14.9 13.0 - 14.9 13.0 - 14.9 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 11 - 20 C 21 - 35 Signal Cycle Length (s) Signal Cycle Length (s) Pedestrian Level of Service - - Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach) Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach) Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Wedsure 1	0.76 - 1	0		13 - 14	60 - 84%
Measure 2 (m)				approaches for transit		
13.0 - 14.9 13.0 - 14.9 11 - 20 C 21 - 35				Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 3 Signal Cycle Length (s) Signal Cycle Length (s) Pedestrian Level of Service - - Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Measure 2	13.0 - 14.9	13.0 - 14.9	11 - 20	C	21 - 35
Measure 3 106 - 120 106 - 120 D Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach) Conflicts (conflicts/approach)		10.0 17.0	10.0 17.0			
Measure 4 Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts (conflicts (approach)) Conflicts (conflicts (conflicts (approach)) Conflicts (conflicts (approach)) Conflicts (conflicts (approach)) Conflicts (approach) Conflict		Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 4 Number of Uncontrolled Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach) Con	Measure 3					
Measure 4 Conflicts (conflicts/approach) Conflicts (conflicts/approach)		106 -120	106 - 120	D		
Measure 4 Conflicts (conflicts/approach) Conflicts (conflicts/approach)				_		_
2.1 - 2.5 2.6 - 3.0	Measure 4	Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Conflicts (conflicts/approach)			-
		2.1 - 2.5	2.6 - 3.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	u know and for detailed or summary results ជ	presentation			
Actual	D	E	С	D	С
SCENARIO: Area Type:	87 Ave & Meadowlark Rd Pro Neighbourhood Connector	e-Development PM			
MODE MODE	 	ં	! 🛱		
			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	D	D	B	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	None	None	None	None
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					100110
Actual	D	E	С	D	С
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		ir
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inte	section?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for (etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0.76 - 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	13 - 14	60 - 84%
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	13.0 - 14.9	13.0 - 14.9	11 - 20	D	36 - 55
Manuss 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)		-	-
ivicasure 4	2.1 - 2.5	2.6 - 3.0			

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	u know and for detailed or summary results μ	presentation			
Actual	С	D	D	D	В
CENARIO:	82 Ave & 109 St Pre-Develop Urban Main Street	ment AM			
Area Type:	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
MODE	 	್	1 🛋		
	•				
уре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Future BRT - B1/B2		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	С	D	D	D	В
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for (etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
ivieasui e 1	0.76 - 1	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%
Massure 7	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	Less than 9	Less than 9	21 - 35	С	21 - 35
Massire 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service		-
Measure 3	91 -105	91 - 105	С		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-

Actual	u know and for detailed or summary results p	_		_	•
SCENARIO:	C 22 Ave 2 100 St Bro Dovelon	mont DM	D	E	С
Area Type:	82 Ave & 109 St Pre-Develop Urban Main Street	ment Pivi			
MODE	 	॔	!		
·ype			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	Hone	Future BRT - B1/B2	140110	Troile .
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	С		D	E	С
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		T.
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the inters	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing s	space, protected intersection,	Yes
	standaı	rds (if applicable) been considere	nd municipal accessibility		Yes
	standa		ed?		Yes
Massure 1	standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	ds (if applicable) been considere	ed?	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1		ds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Ev	aluation		% of Movements with
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	MMLOS EV	aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any	(m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1 Measure 2	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	MMLOS Ev. Enhanced Bicycle Facilities O Average Effective Turning Radius	Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	(m) Less than 11	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84%
Measure 2	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	MMLOS Ev. Enhanced Bicycle Facilities O Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s)	(m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84% Intersection Delay (s)
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9	MMLOS EV. Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9	Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 36 - 55	(m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84% Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	MMLOS EV. Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 36 - 55 Pedestrian Level of Service	(m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84% Intersection Delay (s) 36 - 55

S AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what yo Actual	Α	Α	В	С	Α	
CENARIO:	83 Ave & 109 St AM (Sole Sci		<u> </u>			
rea Туре:	Urban Main Street					
MODE	†	% 0	1 ₩			
rpe			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS			
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С	D	D	
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	Upwards	None	None	
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	83 Ave District Connector	Future BRT - B1/B2			
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None	
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)						
Actual	Α	Α	В	С	Α	
		Active Transportatio	n Design Check			
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	gs provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes	
Does the approaching bike facility continue at a consistent width up to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)?						
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	anying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes	
Is a continuo Does the intersection design prov					Yes Yes	
	ide features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria	e intended turn movements for c	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing			
	ide features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria	e intended turn movements for c etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility d?		Yes	
Does the intersection design prov	ide features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria	e intended turn movements for c etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar rds (if applicable) been considere	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility d?		Yes	
	ide features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria standa	e intended turn movements for cetc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considere	eyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility d? Sluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius	Yes Yes % of Movements with	
Does the intersection design prov	ide features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria standal Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	e intended turn movements for cetc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) arrds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Eva	ryclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility d? Bluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at a	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes	
Does the intersection design prov	ide features which facilitate all th Have Accessibility for Ontaria standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	e intended turn movements for cetc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) arrds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	ryclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility d? Aluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 85 - 100%	
Does the intersection design prov Measure 1 Measure 2	ide features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontaria standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	e intended turn movements for cetc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) arrds (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	ryclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility d? Aluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 85 - 100% Intersection Delay (s)	
Does the intersection design prov	Have Accessibility for Ontaria standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9	e intended turn movements for cetc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) arrds (if applicable) been considere MMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9	nd municipal accessibility d? Sluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 0 - 10	Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes Wof Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 85 - 100% Intersection Delay (s)	
Does the intersection design prov Measure 1 Measure 2	Have Accessibility for Ontaria standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	e intended turn movements for cetc)? Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) arros (if applicable) been considered MMLOS Eva Enhanced Bicycle Facilities > 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	ryclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility d? Aluation Transit Priority Measures Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 0 - 10 Pedestrian Level of Service	Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes Wof Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 85 - 100% Intersection Delay (s)	

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results p				
Actual	A	Α	В	С	Α
SCENARIO: Area Type:	83 Ave & 109 St PM (Sole Sce Urban Main Street	enario)			
MODE	 	%	! ₽		
Гуре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	83 Ave District Connector	Future BRT - B1/B2		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	Α	A Active Transportatio	В	С	Α
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	rsection?	Yes
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for c etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0.76 - 1	> 1	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	85 - 100%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	Less than 9	Less than 9	0 - 10	А	0 - 10
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
ivicasure 3	61 - 75	61 - 75	В		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	1.0	1.0			

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	u know and for detailed or summary results រុ	presentation			
Actual	D	D	В	С	D
CENARIO:	86 Ave & 109 St Pre-Develop Urban Main Street	ment AM			
rea Type: MODE	†	Ś o	<u>•</u>		
уре		·	JNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTION	S	
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Future BRT - B1/B2		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	Active Transportatio	В	С	D
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		No
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	No
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar ds (if applicable) been considere			No
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
Measure 1	Average Crossing Distance (m)	Presence of Bicycle Facilities	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Intersection Delay (s)
ivieasui e 1	9.0 - 11.0	No bike facility	0 - 10	Less than 11	0 - 10
Mossive 2	Marked Crossings	Requirement to stop	Pedestrian Level of Service	Car Level of Service	-
Measure 2	Less than 50% of movements	Greater than 85%	D	А	
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)			
Measure 3	Less than 9	Less than 9			
Measure 4		-	-	-	-
ivicasule 4					

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	u know and for detailed or summary results ព	presentation			
Actual	D	D	В	С	D
CENARIO:	86 Ave & 109 St Pre-Develop Urban Main Street	ment PM			
rea Type: MODE	†	્	<u>•</u>		
уре			JNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTION	S	
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Future BRT - B1/B2		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	Active Transportatio	В	С	D
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		No
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	rsection?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for c etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	No
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar ds (if applicable) been considere			No
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
Measure 1	Average Crossing Distance (m)	Presence of Bicycle Facilities	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Intersection Delay (s)
ivicusure 1	9.0 - 11.0	No bike facility	0 - 10	Less than 11	0 - 10
Massure 2	Marked Crossings	Requirement to stop	Pedestrian Level of Service	Car Level of Service	-
Measure 2	Less than 50% of movements	Greater than 85%	D	А	
Manuary 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	-	-	-
Measure 3	Less than 9	Less than 9			
Measure 4		-	-		-
Measure 4					

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what yo	u know and for detailed or summary results រ	presentation			
Actual	С	D	С	D	В
CENARIO:		ment AM			
еа Туре:	Urban Main Street		_		
MODE	*	%	1₽		
/pe			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction		None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Future BRT - B1/B2		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	С	D	С	D	В
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		No
Does the approaching bike	facility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline:	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design prov	ide features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0.26 - 0.5	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	85 - 100%
M	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
ivieasure Z	MODE Are & 109 St Pre-Development Urban Main Street MODE Target (Custom if necessary) Bustment for Planning Direction Ons for adjustment (if applicable) Idjustment for Strategic Policy Ons for adjustment (if applicable) Actual Are marked pedestrian crossings proceed to a consistent width Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying sthe intersection design provide features which facilitate all the intersection design pro	Less than 9	21 - 35	С	21 - 35
Mossure 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
ivieasure 3	91 -105	91 - 105	С		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
IVICASUI E 4	I				

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what yo	u know and for detailed or summary results ព្	presentation			
Actual	D	D	С	D	В
CENARIO:	87 Ave & 109 St Pre-Develop	ment PM			
rea Туре:	Urban Main Street				
MODE	★	%	1 🛋		
уре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	С	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Future BRT - B1/B2		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D .	D	С	D	В
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	gs provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		No
Does the approaching bike	facility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for (etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Weasure 1	0.26 - 0.5	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	Less than 11	85 - 100%
Measure 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
INCUSUIC Z	Less than 9	Less than 9	21 - 35	С	
					21 - 35
Massire 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	21 - 35
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	
Measure 3 Measure 4					

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results	presentation			
Actual	В	В	D	D	В
SCENARIO:	88 Ave/109 St/Walterdale H	ill/Saskatchewan Drive Pre-L	Development AM		
Агеа Туре:	Urban Main Street				
MODE	*	्र	1=		
Туре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	District Connector Confluence	Future BRT - B1		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	В	В	D	D	В
		Active Transportation	n Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike fa	acility continue at a consistent wi	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
ls a continuou	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes
Does the intersection design provide	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and discount of the considered the			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		<u> </u>
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	> 1	0.76 - 1	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	11 - 12	60 - 84%
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	11.0 - 12.9	11.0 - 12.9	21 - 35	С	21 - 35
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service		
Measure 3	91 -105	91 - 105	В		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
WEASUIC 4	1.0	1.0			

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	u know and for detailed or summary results	presentation			
Actual	В	С	D	D	В
CENARIO:	88 Ave/109 St/Walterdale H Urban Main Street	ill/Saskatchewan Drive Pre-D	Development PM		
Area Type:	A STREET	, c	•		
MODE	大	ೌ O	Ipd		
уре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В		D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	District Connector Confluence	Future BRT - B1		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	В	С	D	D	В
		Active Transportatio	n Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	nying pavement makings delinea	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	Yes
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for a	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
ivieasure 1	>1	0.76 - 1	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS B C D Upwards Upwards None District Connector Confluence None None None None None C D D Active Transportation Design Check vided to connect all approaching pedestrian facilities? p to the edge of the intersection (crosswalk or curb edge of intersecting roadway)? pavement makings delineated for cyclists through the intersection? In Disabilities Act (AODA) and municipal accessibility applicable) been considered? MMLOS Evaluation Enhanced Bicycle Facilities Transit Priority Measures Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 0.76 - 1 No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit 11 - 12 verage Effective Turning Radius (m) 11 - 12.9 21 - 35 C C Signal Cycle Length (s) Pedestrian Level of Service 106 - 120 B Number of Uncontrolled	60 - 84%	
Manager 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	11.0 - 12.9	11.0 - 12.9	21 - 35	С	21 - 35
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service		-
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	В		
Manager	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-		-
Measure 4	1.0	1.0			

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results រុ	presentation			
Actual	D	Е	С	С	В
CENARIO:	82 Ave/University Ave & 114	St Pre-Development AM			
геа Туре:	Neighbourhood Connector				
MODE	*	्र	1=		
уре					
Target (Custom if necessary)	С	С	В	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	Current Cycling Corridor			
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area				
Actual			С	С	В
		Active Transportatio	n Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		No
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	Yes				
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0.76 - 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	15 - 16	85 - 100%
Massura 3	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	15.0 - 17.9	15.0 - 17.9	11 - 20	D	36 - 55
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
ivicasule 3	Greater than 120	Greater than 120	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
	1.6 - 2.0	1.6 - 2.0			

OS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	រ know and for detailed or summary results រ ាំ	resentation				
Actual	D	Е	D	D	С	
CENARIO:	82 Ave/University Ave & 114 Neighbourhood Connector	St Pre-Development PM				
геа Туре:	•					
MODE	*	%	1=		=	
/pe						
Target (Custom if necessary)	С	С	В	D	D	
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	Upwards	None	None	None	
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	Current Cycling Corridor				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	Upwards	None	None	None	None	
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area					
Actual	D	Е	D	D	С	
		Active Transportatio	on Design Check			
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		No	
Does the approaching bike f	No					
Is a continuo	Yes					
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes	
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ar ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes	
		MMLOS Eva	aluation			
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes	
Measure 1	0.76 - 1	0	Transit priority measures at a minimum of one but not all approaches for transit	15 - 16	85 - 100%	
Manager 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)	
ivieasure 2	Measure 2 15.0 - 17.9 15.0 - 17.9 36 - 55 F					
Measure 3	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-	
ivicasule 3	Greater than 120	Greater than 120	D			
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-	
	1.6 - 2.0	1.6 - 2.0				

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	u know and for detailed or summary results	presentation			
Actual	D	D	E	D	С
SCENARIO:	87 Ave & 114 St Pre-Develop Urban Boulevard	oment AM			
Area Type:	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				_
MODE	 	્	1=		
ype .					
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С		E
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Future BRT - B2 920X Rapidbus		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	D	D	E	D	С
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	Yes				
Is a continuo	No				
Does the intersection design provide	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for a etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		<u>JL</u>
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	11 - 12	35 - 59%
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	11.0 - 12.9	11.0 - 12.9	36 - 55	D	36 - 55
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service		-
Measure 3	91 -105	91 - 105	D		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
IVICASUI E 4	2.6 - 3.0	2.6 - 3.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	know and for detailed or summary results	presentation			
Actual	E		E	D	С
	87 Ave & 114 St Pre-Develop Urban Boulevard	ment PM			
Area Type:	•			<u> </u>	
MODE	X	્	1=		
уре					
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С		E
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area		Future BRT - B2 920X Rapidbus		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	Е	Е	E	D	С
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike fa	Yes				
Is a continuou	No				
Does the intersection design provide	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for a etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and discount of the considered the			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		<u>Į</u>
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	11 - 12	60 - 84%
Manuary 2	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	11.0 - 12.9	11.0 - 12.9	36 - 55	D	36 - 55
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	Е		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
ivicasal C 4	2.6 - 3.0	2.6 - 3.0			

Actual		oresentation	_	_	_
	C	D	D	E	В
CENARIO: Area Type:	82 Ave & 112 St Pre-Develop Urban Main Street	ment Alvi			
MODE	 	ं	!		
уре					
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	TO THE	No.ic		140110
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	С	D	D	E	В
		Active Transportation	on Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	gs provided to connect all approa	aching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the inters	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	us amount of space and accompa	inying pavement makings deline	ated for cyclists through the inter	section?	No
Is a continuou Does the intersection design provi					No Yes
	de features which facilitate all the	e intended turn movements for	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing or state of the control of the		
	de features which facilitate all the	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility		Yes
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considere	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing and municipal accessibility		Yes
	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and sift applicable) been considered MMLOS Ev	nd municipal accessibility ed?	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius	Yes Yes Yes
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	e intended turn movements for etc)? Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) and (if applicable) been considered MMLOS EV Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	nd municipal accessibility ed? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any	space, protected intersection, Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considered MMLOS EV Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius	nd municipal accessibility ed? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84%
Does the intersection design provides the intersection design prov	de features which facilitate all the Have Accessibility for Ontarian standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	e intended turn movements for etc)? ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and sets (if applicable) been considered MMLOS EV Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	nd municipal accessibility ed? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84% Intersection Delay (s)
Does the intersection design provi	Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9	e intended turn movements for etc)? Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) ards (if applicable) been considered MIMLOS EV Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9	nd municipal accessibility ad? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes Wof Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84% Intersection Delay (s)
Does the intersection design provides the intersection design prov	Have Accessibility for Ontarial standar Enhanced Pedestrian Measures 0.76 - 1 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	e intended turn movements for etc)? Ins with Disabilities Act (AODA) a rds (if applicable) been considered. MMLOS EV Enhanced Bicycle Facilities 0 Average Effective Turning Radius (m) 9.0 - 10.9 Signal Cycle Length (s)	nd municipal accessibility ed? aluation Transit Priority Measures No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit Transit Movement Delay (s) 21 - 35 Pedestrian Level of Service	Average Effective Turning Radius (m) Less than 11 Car Level of Service	Yes Yes % of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes 60 - 84% Intersection Delay (s)

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	u know and for detailed or summary results រ ា				
Actual	С	D	D	E	С
SCENARIO: Area Type:	82 Ave & 112 St Pre-Develop Urban Main Street	ment PM			
MODE	 	Š	1 ₽		
Гуре					
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	С	SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS D	D	D
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	С	D	D	E	С
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	aching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	facility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interso	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	No
Is a continuo	No				
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for (etc)?	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) a ds (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		
Measure 1	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	0.76 - 1	0	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	60 - 84%
M	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	9.0 - 10.9	9.0 - 10.9	36 - 55	D	36 - 55
Mass 2	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service	-	-
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	С		
		i e	-		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results	presentation			
Actual	В	В	С	С	В
SCENARIO:	87 Ave & 110 St Pre-Develop Urban Boulevard	ment AM			
Area Type:	•			<u> </u>	
MODE	/	્	1=		
Туре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS		
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С		E
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	110 St Neighbourhood Route	Future BRT - B2		
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)					
Actual	В	В	С	С	В
		Active Transportation	n Design Check		
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes
Does the approaching bike f	Yes				
ls a continuo	Yes				
Does the intersection design provi	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and discontinuous (if applicable) been considere			Yes
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		<u> </u>
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes
Measure 1	>1	> 1	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	10 - 34%
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)
Measure 2	Less than 9	Less than 9	0 - 10	А	0 - 10
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service		-
Measure 3	91 -105	91 - 105	В		
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-
Weasure 4	1.1 - 1.5	1.0			

LOS AND DATA ENTRY - Use this to enter what you	ı know and for detailed or summary results	presentation					
Actual	В	В	С	D	С		
SCENARIO:	87 Ave & 110 St Pre-Develop Urban Boulevard	ment PM					
Area Type:	•				<u>_</u>		
MODE	 	્	1=				
Туре			SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS				
Target (Custom if necessary)	В	В	С		Е		
Adjustment for Planning Direction	Upwards	None	Upwards	None	None		
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)	Pedestrian Priority Area	110 St Neighbourhood Route	Future BRT - B2				
Adjustment for Strategic Policy	None	None	None	None	None		
Reasons for adjustment (if applicable)							
Actual	В	В	С	D	С		
		Active Transportation	n Design Check				
	Are marked pedestrian crossing	s provided to connect all approa	ching pedestrian facilities?		Yes		
Does the approaching bike fa	acility continue at a consistent w	idth up to the edge of the interse	ection (crosswalk or curb edge of	intersecting roadway)?	Yes		
ls a continuou	Is a continuous amount of space and accompanying pavement makings delineated for cyclists through the intersection? Yes						
Does the intersection design provide	de features which facilitate all th	e intended turn movements for o	cyclists (e.g. bike boxes, queuing	space, protected intersection,	Yes		
		ns with Disabilities Act (AODA) and discount of the considered the			Yes		
		MMLOS Eva	aluation		<u> </u>		
	Enhanced Pedestrian Measures	Enhanced Bicycle Facilities	Transit Priority Measures	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	% of Movements with Dedicated Turn Lanes		
Measure 1	>1	> 1	No transit priority measures at any approaches for transit	Less than 11	10 - 34%		
	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Average Effective Turning Radius (m)	Transit Movement Delay (s)	Car Level of Service	Intersection Delay (s)		
Measure 2	Less than 9	Less than 9	11 - 20	В	11 - 20		
	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Signal Cycle Length (s)	Pedestrian Level of Service		-		
Measure 3	106 -120	106 - 120	В				
Measure 4	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	Number of Uncontrolled Conflicts (conflicts/approach)	-	-	-		
WEASUIC 4	1.1 - 1.5	1.0					